

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/529,680	04/17/2000	GERHARD WOTTING	MO-5599/LEA3	1031
157	7590 09/28/2005		EXAMINER	
BAYER MATERIAL SCIENCE LLC			GROUP, KARL E	
PITTSBURGH, PA 15205			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	•		1755	
			DATE MAILED: 09/28/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/529,680	WOTTING ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Karl E. Group	1755			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19	Sentember 2005				
2a)□		is action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowa		osecution as to the merits is			
٠,٣	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
D:	•		0.0.2.0.			
_	on of Claims					
	Claim(s) 14-18 and 24-28 is/are pending in the	• •				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)∐	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠						
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.				
Application Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) 🔲 Notice	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
	No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Patent and Tr	1.00					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05) Application/Control Number: 09/529,680 Page 2

Art Unit: 1755

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 9-7-05 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 3. Claims 14,26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A ratio may not be expressed in percentage therefor 65% to 74% is improper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 and 103

- 4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 5. Claims 14-18,24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a or e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Oda et al (5,804,523), Tajima et al (5,885,916) and Hintermayer et al (5,998,319), each taken alone, for reasons of record.

Art Unit: 1755

The amounts set forth in new claims 26-28 falls within the ranges taught by the prior art references. Furthermore yttria is taught as a sintering aid in the references. The prior art references do not disclose the mass loss when the silicon nitride body is immersed in HCI. Products of identical chemical composition cannot have mutually exclusive properties. In re Spada, 15 USPQ2d 1655,1658 (Fed. Circ. 1990).

Applicants argue the prior art references fail to teach the claimed sintering aid ratio of 65 to 75%. This is not persuasive because Oda et al teach a silica to rare earth ratio of up to 3.8. Tajima et al teach a ratio of up to 3.5. Hintemeyer et al teach a glass having greater than 65% silica.

As to the mass loss when the silicon nitride body is immersed in HCl applicants have not shown by way of tangible evidence that the prior art products do not posses the claimed property.

It is well settled that when a claimed composition appears to be substantially the same as a composition disclosed in the prior art, the burden is properly upon the applicant to prove by way of tangible evidence that the prior art composition does not necessarily possess characteristics attributed to the CLAIMED composition. In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Circ. 1990); In re Fitzgerald, 619 F.2d 67, 205 USPQ 594 (CCPA 1980); In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d 2109, 169 USPQ 226 (CCPA 1971).

The examples in the instant disclosure are not considered representative of the prior art references therefor the rejections are maintained.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karl E. Group whose telephone number is 571-272-1368. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:30-4:00) First Friday Off.

Art Unit: 1755

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jerry Lorengo can be reached on 571-272-1233. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Karl E Group (Primary Examiner Art Unit 1755)

Keg 9-22-05